REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-15 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected for the same reasons recited in the prior Office Action -- i.e., Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Monro (WO 98/37700, cited in the IDS filed 19 June 2002); Claims 8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monro, as applied to claim 7, in combination with Jiankun Li; Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monro, as applied to claim 7, in combination with Kleihorst (Implementation of DCT-Domain Motion Estimation and Compensation); Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monro and Jiankun Li, as applied to claim 8, in further combination with Fujikawa (USP no. 4,972,260) and over Monro and Kleihorst, as applied to claim 9, in further combination with Fujikawa.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the reasons for rejecting the claims for the same arguments presented in the Response to the rejection of the claims in the prior Office Action, which are applicable to the rejection of the claims in the instant Office Action, and are reasserted, as if in full, herein.

In response to Applicant's arguments presented in the Response to the rejection of the claims in the prior Office, the instant Office Action states that "even though Monro and the present claims do not use the same terminology, they are inherently performing the same function. Monro transmits position [sic] of newly significant bits along with the STOP signal. The positions of those newly significant bits, inherently includes an outmost position in column and an outermost position in row, which is essentially maximum row and maximum column of the scanned area" (see instant OA, page 2, lines 5-10). The Office Action further states that "Monro discloses scanning and transmitting significant coefficient values in an order of decreasing bit plane significance ... wherein for each bit plane the step of scanning and transmitting is performed in a rectangular scan zone ... starting from a corner of the block, wherein Rmax represents a maximum row number and Cmax presents a maximum column number and are determined as the outermost positions of the determination of newly significant coefficients within each bit

plane (63 in figure 3 is the outermost positions of this rectangular scan zone) and the Rmax and Cmax values are transmitted in the bit-stream (page 9, line 20-page 10, line 13)" (see instant OA, page 2, line 14-page 3, line 2).

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Rmax and Cmax values are inherent in the teachings of Monro and that the Rmax and Cmax values are transmitted in the bit-stream. Monro teaches, in Figure 3, scanning block in a zig-zag manner wherein bits 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 17 are indicated to be significant. The zig-zag scanning tests each of the bits in the following order:

0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, etc..

As all bits beyond bit 17 are non-significant, these bits are not considered further.

In scanning the aforementioned bits in a zig-zag pattern, the maximum row scanned includes bit 10, which represents row number 5 and the maximum column scanned includes bit 15, which represents column number 6. In this case, the maximum row and column that may be deduced or determined from the bit-stream is 5 and 6 respectively.

However, in accordance with the subject matter claimed in the instant invention, the maximum row and column are 3 and 5, respectively, which are represented by bits 3 and 14, respectively.

Hence, contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, although Rmax and Cmax values may be deduced from the bit-stream, and, in the example provided by Monro, it has been shown that the values of Rmax and Cmax determined from the bit stream are not the same as those values recited in the claims. Furthermore, assuming the values of Rmax and Cmax may be deduced from the bit-stream, these values are not inherent as these values may change dependent upon the position of newly significant bits. For example, referring to Figure 3 of Monro, if bit 30 were considered significant, then the Rmax and Cmax determined by the bit-stream would be 7 and 8. respectively. However, in accordance with the principles of the invention. the Rmax and Cmax would be 3 and 6, respectively.

Notwithstanding the arguments above, and contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, Monro fails to teach that the values of Rmax and Cmax are transmitted in the bit-stream as is recited in the claims. As shown, an Rmax and a Cmax may be

deduced from the bit-stream, but these values are not the same as those described in the claims. Nor are these values transmitted in the bit stream as is recited in the claims.

For the arguments made in response to the rejections of the claims in the prior Office Action and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of all the claims has be overcome. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be with drawn and the claims allowed.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell Gross
Registration No. 40,007

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: December 16, 2005

Mail all correspondence to:
Russell Gross, Registration No. 40,007
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615